

DE920000088US1

10/020,659

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is filed in response to the office action mailed 06/21/2005. A petition and fee for a two month extension until 11/21/2005 is filed herewith.

In paragraph 2 of the office action, Fig. 2, 3, and 4 are objected to because the reference numbers 295, 380, and 3150, respectively, are not mentioned in the description. The specification has been amended to include the missing reference numbers. Paragraph [0042] has been amended to include the reference number 295, paragraph [0047] has been amended to include the reference number 380, and paragraph [0049] has been amended to include the reference number 3150. It is submitted that new matter has not been added as the reference numbers are shown in the drawings, and that the mentioned reference numbers were omitted through error and without deceptive intent. In view of the amendments to the specification it is submitted that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5), and it is requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In paragraphs 3-4, claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-24, 16-17, 25-26, 28-29, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knox et al. (US 5,872,968), hereinafter Knox. Knox discloses a data processing network which has a client connected to first and second servers in which the first and second servers are operable to communicate with the network according to first and second incompatible data communication protocols. In Knox, on connection to the network on power-on, the client issues a 'bootrequest' packet onto the network, which packet specifies the hardware address of the client. On receipt of the rootrequest packet, a BOOTP server on the network responsible for the client returns a 'bootreply' to be downloaded

DE920000088US1

10/020,659

to the client. On receipt of the bootreply, the client requests a transfer of the file which is stored and executed by the client (see Col. 4, lines 38-61).

Claims 1, 6, 13, 18, 25, and 30 have been amended to claim methods, apparatus, and program products for the reconfiguration of a network in the event of a network failure wherein configuration data may have been lost. The claims have further been amended to claim that, after the first type computers have been booted up under the control of the second type computers, the first type computers periodically send configuration information to the second type computer. In the event the second type computer fails and configuration information may have been lost, the second type computer restarts and collects configuration information periodically sent by the first type computer to the second type computer after the failure of the second type computer, enabling the network to be reconfigured. It is submitted the Knox does not teach or suggest such reconfiguration in the event of a failure, but only teaches the booting up of client computers by a server. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6, 13, 18, 25, and 30, and claims depended therefrom, are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Knox, which allowance is respectfully requested.

At paragraphs 5-6, claims 3, 15, 27, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knox in view of Subramaniam et al. (US 6,070,187), hereinafter Subramaniam. As discussed above, Knox teaches booting up client computers in a network by a server computer by the exchange of bootrequests and bootreplies. Subramaniam discloses sending the IP address of a network node when a network node seeks to renew the lease on its IP address. As discussed above, the claims have been amended to claim methods, apparatus, and program products for the

DE920000088US1

10/020,659

reconfiguration of a network when the second type computer fails which may result in the loss of configuration information. As claimed, the first type computer periodically sends configuration information to the second type of computer (and not just when it seeks to renew the lease on its IP address as in Subramaniam) such that when the second type computer restarts after a failure, the configuration information may be collected by the second type computer after its failure such that the network may be reconfigured. The sending of configuration data from the first type computers to the second type computers is clearly disclosed in paragraph [0041] of the present application. It is submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in Subramaniam that network nodes may periodically send configuration information to a server, such that if the server fails, it may collect the configuration information sent after the server fails and is restarted, thereby enabling the network to be reconfigured, as claims. It is submitted that claims 3, 15, 27, and 36 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Knox in view of Subramaniam, which allowance is respectfully requested.

At paragraph 7, claims 6-12, 18-24, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahlmann (US 6,578,074). As pointed out above, Knox discloses the booting of clients by a server using an exchange of bootrequest and boottreply messages. Subramaniam discloses sending the IP address from a network node to a server when the network node seeks to renew the lease on its IP address. Bahlmann discloses a server that allows for network lease customization of client groups and individual clients. Each provisioning server may read the existing client configuration information and write updated information to the database (Col. 10, lines 12-14). In the claims, it is claimed that the first type computers periodically send configuration information to the second type computer, so

DE920000088US1

10/020,659

that if the second type server fails and the configuration information is lost, i.e. the data base 18 is empty after the breakdown of the server which is then refilled continuously by receiving and evaluating the location information specified in the plurality of infoboot messages received by the server (see paragraph [0048] lines 6-10 of the present application wherein Fig. 4 is discussed). It is thus submitted that claims 6-12, 18-24, and 30-34 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bahlmann, which allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 15, and 27 are amended to make clear that configuration information is in Infoboot messages having the same format as boot messages. Claims 4, 16, and 28 have been amended to correct an dependency problem for the Infoboot messages. Allowance of amended claims 3-4, 15-26, and 27-28 is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED



BY: JOHN E. CAMPBELL-AGENT
Registration No. 52,687
Phone: 845-433-1156
Fax: 845-432-9601